UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,368	09/11/2003	Brian N. Belanger	2222.3810000	3018

26111   7590   01/04/2010
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
JOHNSON, CARLTON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2436	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/04/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/659,368	BELANGER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CARLTON V. JOHNSON	2436	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 September 2009</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail. Date _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to application amendments filed on 9-24-2009.

2.   Claims **1 - 42** are pending.   Claims **7, 23, 24, 29, 30** have been amended.

Claims **41, 42** are new.   Claims **1, 7, 15, 16, 23, 24, 29, 30** are independent.   This

application was filed 9-11-2003.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's additional arguments have been fully considered but were not

persuasive.

3.1   Applicant argues that the referenced prior art does not disclose, *in response to a*

comparison that indicates that access by the access candidate is prohibited.

The passage cited by Applicant (see Timson col. 3, lines 28-32) discloses a

situation where no communication is allowed.   The Timson prior art discloses that

modules must belong to the same security scheme in order to communicate with each

other. (see Timson col. 4, lines 16-32: encrypted communications, must belong to

same security scheme to communicate)   Otherwise, the encryption keys utilized by a

particular security scheme do not allow communications with modules that are not part

of the same security scheme.

The security scheme is setup by the controller module. (see Timson col. 4, lines

33-42: security scheme is setup by controller module)   The controller module also sets

up the other types of modules such as the additional module designated the resolution

authority. (see Timson col. 4, line 60 - col. 5, line 4)

Without a successful authorization comparison (a match), access is not permitted.
All of the required functions are disclosed by the Timson prior art as indicated in the
accompanying citations. (see Timson col. 3, line 34 - col. 4, line 15: access information;
request/response authorization information; comparison of candidate (authorization)
information; authorization verification, or prohibition if verification not successful) The
Examiner has reevaluated Applicant's remarks and has determined that the Applicant
desires a third party to act as a resolution authority in performing an additional
authentication service.

The Timson prior art discloses the capability to add additional authentication
modules to the authentication procedures. These additional authentication modules can
generate a hierarchical structure for the authentication process with access to the
resolution authority performed as a last authentication process as per claim limitation.
(see Timson col 4, line 60 - col. 5, line 4: hierarchical authorization structure) The
Timson and Moreh prior art combination discloses the usage of a resolution authority to
provide an additional authentication services. (see Moreh col. 2, lines 48-62; col. 5, line
56 - col. 6, line 19: authentication services between client and server using intermediate
entity (protocol proxy))

The enabling module can grant permissions by writing permissions data to a
module to make it an enabling module such as the resolution authority in Moreh prior
art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5.   Claim **41** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There does appear to be any disclosure for the claim limitation: *"receiving supplemental evidence verifying the attributes of the access candidate"*.   The term "supplemental" does not appear in the specification or the original claims. The specification in paragraph [0025] mentions *"other evidence"*.   The *"supplemental evidence"* will be interpreted as other evidence.   The class distinction evidence (current location, citizenship) appears to fit the other evidence category.

        Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims **1 - 4, 7 - 10, 14, 16 - 19, 24 - 26, 29 - 33, 37 - 40** are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Timson et al.** (US Patent No. **6,041,412**) in

view of **Moreh et al.** (US Patent No. **6,959,336**) and further in view of **Bacha et al.** (US

Patent No. **6,839,843**).

Regarding Claims 1, 7, 24, 29, Timson discloses a method for providing an access

candidate access to secured electronic data, the method comprising:

- a) receiving, <u>by a controller associated with the secured electronic data,</u> a request

    for access candidate access to the secured electronic data by a controller

    associated with the secured electronic data; (see Timson col. 3, lines 34-40; col.

    3, lines 57-64: request processing (i.e. request submitted and processed))

Furthermore, Timson discloses the following:

- b) comparing, at the controller, one or more attributes of the access candidate with

    one or more access requirements associated with the secured electronic data;

    (see Timson col. 2, lines 50-59: attributes; col. 3, lines 11-16: determine (i.e.

    comparing), enable access)

- c) submitting, by the controller, a request for authorization in response to a

    comparison that indicates that access by the access candidate is prohibited; (see

    Timson col. 3, lines 34-40; col. 3, lines 57-64: request processing, resolution

    authority; col. 2, lines 50-59: attributes; col. 4, lines 7-11: access determination

    (comparison, match) required for access (i.e. prohibited without authorization))

    and ;

d) granting the access candidate access to the secured electronic data if

authorization for such access and <u>a determination of whether to authorize access</u>

<u>of the access candidate to the secure electronic data, wherein the determination</u>

<u>is based on access candidate information and request related information</u>. (see

Timson col. 4, lines 7-15: access enabled (i.e. granted) based on transmitted

permission data)

Furthermore, Timson discloses access determination using additional authorization

modules. (see Timson col 4, line 60 - col. 5, line 4: additional authorization modules)

Timson does not specifically disclose a resolution authority or a 3rd party providing

authentication services. However, Moreh discloses a resolution authority. (see

Moreh col. 2, lines 48-62; col. 5, line 56 - col. 6, line 19: authentication services

between client and server using intermediate entity (protocol proxy))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson

to use authentication services such as a resolution authority as taught by Moreh.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of

Moreh in order to permit users and service provides the flexibility of choosing where

to authenticate.   (see Moreh col. 2, lines 44-46)

Timson-Moreh does not specifically disclose modifying access requirements.

However, Bacha discloses configured to modify the one or more access

requirements. (see Bacha col. 10, lines 48-60: another authorized user such as a

resolution authority with ability to update access control information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson-Moreh for modifying access requirements as taught by Bacha.   One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Bacha to improve system efficiency by centralization of user access information and to use richer search parameters. (see Bacha col. 3, lines 18-24)

Regarding Claims 2, 8, 17, 25, 31, Timson discloses the method as in Claims 1, 8, 16, 24, 30, further comprising granting the access candidate access to the secured electronic data in response to a comparison that indicates that access by the access candidate is not prohibited. (see Timson col. 4, lines 7-11: access enabled (i.e. granted), not prohibited; col. 4, lines 7-11: access determination (comparison, match) required for access (i.e. prohibited without authorization))

Regarding Claims 3, 9, 18, 32, Timson discloses the method as in Claims 2, 7, 16, 30, further comprising denying the access candidate access to the secured electronic data if denied authorization. (see Timson col. 3, lines 28-32; col. 4, lines 11-15: access denied)

Furthermore, Timson discloses access determination using additional authorization modules. (see Timson col 4, line 60 - col. 5, line 4: additional authorization modules) Timson does not specifically disclose a resolution authority or a 3rd party providing authentication services.

However, Moreh discloses a resolution authority. (see Moreh col. 2, lines 48-62; col. 5,

line 56 - col. 6, line 19: authentication services between client and server using

intermediate entity (protocol proxy))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson to

use authentication services such as a resolution authority as taught by Moreh.   One of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Moreh in

order to permit users and service provides the flexibility of choosing where to

authenticate.   (see Moreh col. 2, lines 44-46)

Regarding Claims 4, 10, 19, 26, 33, Timson discloses the method as in Claims 1, 7,

16, 24, 30, wherein the one or more access requirements associated with the secured

electronic data are represented as part of a graphical display associated with the

access candidate and accessed for display to the controller via a network. (see Timson

col. 5, lines 26-35: display capability for user interface information; access permission

information)

Regarding Claims 14, 37, Timson discloses the method as in Claims 7, 30, wherein at

least one of the request for access to the first security level or the request for access to

the second security level is submitted by one or more sponsors. (see Timson col. 14,

lines 13-20: request, 1st level security; col. 14, lines 25-35: request processing, 2nd

level security)

Regarding Claim 16, Timson discloses a system for providing an access candidate

access to secured electronic data, the system comprising:

   a) storage configured to receive and store the electronic data; (see Timson col. 18,

   lines 9-12; col. 18, lines 18-21: storage capability for accessible data)

   Furthermore, Timson discloses the following:

   b) one or more resources configured to access and manipulate the electronic data;

   (see Timson col. 2, lines 31-34; col. 2, lines 40-41: interrogatable and enabling

   modules, resources to access and manipulate data)

   c) means for evaluating a request for access candidate access to the one or more

   resources, wherein the evaluation of the request includes a first comparison of

   one or more attributes of the access candidate with one or more access

   requirements associated with the one or more resources; (see Timson col. 5,

   lines 5-13: software means; col. 2, lines 50-59: attributes; col. 3, lines 34-40; col.

   3, lines 57-64: request processing, evaluation to enable access)

   d) means for granting the access candidate access to the one or more resources if

   the first comparison indicates that access is not prohibited; (see Timson col. 5,

   lines 5-13: software means; col. 4, lines 7-11: access enabled (i.e. granted))

   e) means for evaluating a request for access candidate access to the electronic

   data by the one or more resources, wherein the evaluation of the request

   includes a second comparison of one or more attributes of the access candidate

   with one or more access requirements associated with the electronic data; (see

   Timson col. 5, lines 5-13: software means; col. 2, lines 31-34; col. 2, lines 40-41:

   interrogatable and enabling modules, resources to access and manipulate data)

f) means for submitting a request for authorization if the second comparison

indicates that access to the electronic data by the access candidate is prohibited;

(see Timson col. 5, lines 5-13: software means; col. 3, lines 34-40; col. 3, lines

57-64: request processing, must be authorized to access data) and

g) means for granting the access candidate access to the electronic data using the

one or more resources if authorized. (see Timson col. 5, lines 5-13: software

means; col. 3, lines 28-32; col. 4, lines 11-15: access enabled (i.e. granted))

Furthermore, Timson discloses access determination using additional authorization

modules. (see Timson col 4, line 60 - col. 5, line 4: additional authorization modules)

Timson does not specifically disclose a resolution authority or a 3rd party providing

authentication services. However, Moreh discloses a resolution authority. (see

Moreh col. 2, lines 48-62; col. 5, line 56 - col. 6, line 19: authentication services

between client and server using intermediate entity (protocol proxy))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson

to use authentication services such as a resolution authority as taught by Moreh.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of

Moreh in order to permit users and service provides the flexibility of choosing where

to authenticate.   (see Moreh col. 2, lines 44-46)

Timson-Moreh does not specifically disclose modifying access requirements.

However, Bacha discloses configured to modify the one or more access

requirements. (see Bacha col. 10, lines 48-60: another authorized user such as a

resolution authority with ability to update access control information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson-Moreh for modifying access requirements as taught by Bacha. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Bacha to improve system efficiency by centralization of user access information and to use richer search parameters. (see Bacha col. 3, lines 18-24)

Regarding Claim 30, Timson discloses in a data security system having a first security level securing one or more resources for manipulating electronic data and a second security level securing access to the electronic data by the one or more resources, a method for determining an access candidate's access to the electronic data, the method comprising:

a) receiving a request for access to the first security level; (see Timson col. 3, lines 34-40: request processing (i.e. submitted and processed))

Furthermore, Timson disclose the following:

b) granting the access candidate access to the first security level based on a comparison of one or more attribute: of the access candidate with one or more access requirements associated with the first security level; (see Timson col. 14, lines 13-20: 1st security level processing)

c) receiving a request for access to the second security level; (see Timson col. 3, lines 34-40; col. 3, lines 57-64: request processing (i.e. submitted and processed)) and

d) submitting a request for authorization to a resolution authority in response to a

comparison of one or more attributes of the access candidate with one or more

access requirements associated with the second security level that indicates that

access to the second security level by the access candidate is prohibited without

authorization and determining the access candidate's access to the second

security level. (see Timson col. 3, lines 34-40; col. 3, lines 57-64: request

processing; col. 14, lines 25-35: 2nd security level processing; col. 4, lines 7-11:

access determination (comparison, match) required for access (i.e. prohibited

without authorization))

Furthermore, Timson discloses the generation of a hierarchical structure for access

determination such as additional authorization modules. (see Timson col 4, line 60 -

col. 5, line 4: hierarchical authorization structure)

Timson does not specifically disclose a resolution authority or a 3rd party providing

authentication services.

However, Moreh discloses a resolution authority. (see Moreh col. 2, lines 48-62; col.

5, line 56 - col. 6, line 19: authentication services between client and server using

intermediate entity (protocol proxy))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson

to use authentication services such as a resolution authority as taught by Moreh.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of

Moreh in order to permit users and service provides the flexibility of choosing where

to authenticate. (see Moreh col. 2, lines 44-46)

Timson-Moreh does not specifically disclose modifying access requirements.
However, Bacha discloses configured to modify one or more access requirements
associated with the second security level. (see Bacha col. 10, lines 48-60: another
authorized user such as a resolution authority with ability to update access control
information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson-
Moreh for modifying access requirements as taught by Bacha. One of ordinary skill
in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Bacha to improve
system efficiency by centralization of user access information and to use richer
search parameters. (see Bacha col. 3, lines 18-24)

Regarding Claim 38, Timson discloses the method as in claim 1, further comprising
determining the authorization by granting a waiver of one or more access requirements
associated with the secured electronic data. (see Timson col. 4, lines 44-56: permission
attributes for records are changeable; col 10, lines 37-45: generation of access
permissions, data modules)

Furthermore, Timson discloses the generation of a hierarchical structure for access
determination such as additional authorization modules. (see Timson col 4, line 60 -
col. 5, line 4: hierarchical authorization structure)

Timson does not specifically disclose a resolution authority or a 3rd party providing
authentication services.

However, Moreh discloses a resolution authority. (see Moreh col. 2, lines 48-62; col. 5,

line 56 - col. 6, line 19: authentication services between client and server using

intermediate entity (protocol proxy))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson to

use authentication services such as a resolution authority as taught by Moreh.   One of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Moreh in

order to permit users and service provides the flexibility of choosing where to

authenticate.   (see Moreh col. 2, lines 44-46)

Regarding Claim 39, Timson discloses the method as in claim 1, further comprising:

determining the authorization by modifying the one or more access requirements

associated with the secured electronic data. (see Timson col. 4, lines 44-56: permission

attributes for records are changeable; col 10, lines 37-45: generation of access

permissions, data modules)

Furthermore, Timson discloses the generation of a hierarchical structure for access

determination such as additional authorization modules. (see Timson col 4, line 60 -

col. 5, line 4: hierarchical authorization structure)

Timson does not specifically disclose a resolution authority or a 3rd party providing

authentication services.

However, Moreh discloses a resolution authority. (see Moreh col. 2, lines 48-62; col. 5,

line 56 - col. 6, line 19: authentication services between client and server using

intermediate entity (protocol proxy))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson to use authentication services such as a resolution authority as taught by Moreh.   One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Moreh in order to permit users and service provides the flexibility of choosing where to authenticate.   (see Moreh col. 2, lines 44-46)

Regarding Claim 40, Timson discloses the method as in claim 1, further comprising determining the authorization by excluding the electronic data assigned to one or more prohibited data classes from access by the access candidate. (see Timson col. 4, lines 44-56: permission attributes for records are changeable; col 10, lines 37-45: generation of access permissions, data modules)

Furthermore, Timson discloses access determination using additional authorization modules. (see Timson col 4, line 60 - col. 5, line 4: additional authorization modules) Timson does not specifically disclose a resolution authority or a 3rd party providing authentication services.
However, Moreh discloses a resolution authority. (see Moreh col. 2, lines 48-62; col. 5, line 56 - col. 6, line 19: authentication services between client and server using intermediate entity (protocol proxy))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson to use authentication services such as a resolution authority as taught by Moreh.   One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Moreh in order to permit users and service provides the flexibility of choosing where to

authenticate.   (see Moreh col. 2, lines 44-46)

8.   Claims **5, 6, 11 - 13, 15, 20 - 23, 27, 28, 34 - 36,** 41, 42 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Timson-Moreh-Bacha** and further in view of

Orsini et al. (US PGPUB No. **20040049687**).

Regarding Claims 5, 11, 13, 27, Timson discloses the method as in Claims 1, 7, 24,

wherein the one or more access requirements. (see Timson col. 2, lines 50-59; col. 2,

lines 41-49: attributes, permissions; col. 3, lines 34-40: required to access resources)

Timson does not specifically disclose one or more access requirements related to at

least one of a citizenship status of the access candidate or a current location of the

access candidate.

However, Orsini discloses wherein one or more access requirements are related to at

least one of a citizenship status of the access candidate and a current location of the

access candidate. (see Orsini paragraph [0013], lines 1-3; paragraph [0060], lines 4-13:

management of secure data, parameters (i.e. attributes) agreement, location

information)

      It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson for

one or more access requirements related to at least one of a citizenship status of the

access candidate and a current location of the access candidate as taught by Orsini.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of

Orsini for a relatively fast, secure, and efficient authentication of data streams.   (see

Orsini paragraph [0012], lines 1-3; paragraph [0013], lines 1-3)

Regarding Claims 6, 12, 22, 28, 36, Timson discloses the method as in Claims 5, 11,

16, 27, 30, wherein the one or more attributes of the access candidate. (see Timson

col. 2, lines 50-59: permissions, attributes for requestor (i.e. access candidate); col. 3,

lines 34-40: required to access resources)

Timson does not specifically disclose one or more attributes relate to at least one of a

citizenship status of the access candidate and a current location of the access

candidate.

However, Orsini discloses wherein one or more attributes of the access candidate relate

to the at least one of a citizenship status of the access candidate or a current location of

the access candidate. (see Orsini paragraph [0013], lines 1-3; paragraph [0060], lines

4-13: management of secure data, parameters (i.e. attributes) agreement, location

information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson for

one or more attributes related to at least one of a citizenship status of the access

candidate and a current location of the access candidate as taught by Orsini. One of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Orsini for

a relatively fast, secure, and efficient authentication of data streams.   (see Orsini

paragraph [0012], lines 1-3; paragraph [0013], lines 1-3)

Regarding Claim 15, Timson discloses in a data security system having a first security

level securing one or more resources for manipulating electronic data and a second

security level securing the electronic data, a method for providing an access candidate

access to the electronic data, the method comprising:

    a) identifying a plurality of data subsets of the electronic data; (see Timson col. 6

       lines 43-46; multiple data sets and data records (i.e. a plurality of datasets))

Furthermore, Timson disclose the following:

    d) granting the access candidate access to the first security level based at least in

       part on an evaluation of the request for access to the first level; ((see Timson

       col. 14, lines 13-20: request, 1st level security)

    g) granting the access candidate access to the requested at least one data subset

       at the second security level if authorization is provided upon receipt of the

       request for authorization. (see Timson col. 14, lines 25-35: request, 2nd level

       security; col. 4, lines 7-11: access enabled (i.e. granted))

Furthermore, Timson discloses wherein a request (see Timson col. 3, lines 34-40;

col. 3, lines 57-64: request processing; col. 2, lines 56-59; col. 17, lines 4-11: country

attribute), and determining, for each data subset, at least one data class associated

with the data subset (see Timson col. 2, lines 50-59: one data class or attributes of a

class), and receiving from a first sponsor of the access candidate, a request for

access to the first security level (see Timson col. 3, lines 34-40: request processing;

col. 2, lines 56-59; col. 17, lines 4-11: country attribute, requestor attributes; col. 14,

lines 13-20: request, 1st level security), and a second sponsor of the access

candidate, a request for access to at least one data subset at the second security

level in response to an indication that access to the first security level has been

granted (see Timson col. 14, lines 25-35: request, 2nd level security), and a request

for authorization in response to a comparison of the at least one data class of the

requested data subset that indicates that access to a requested data subset at the

second level by the access candidate is prohibited. (see Timson col. 3, lines 34-40:

permissions required to access data; col. 4, lines 7-11: access determination

(comparison, match) required for access (i.e. prohibited without authorization))

Furthermore, Timson discloses access determination using additional authorization

modules. (see Timson col 4, line 60 - col. 5, line 4: additional authorization modules)

Timson does not specifically disclose a resolution authority or a 3rd party providing

authentication services.

However, Moreh discloses a resolution authority. (see Moreh col. 2, lines 48-62; col.

5, line 56 - col. 6, line 19: authentication services between client and server using

intermediate entity (protocol proxy))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson-

Orsini to use authentication services such as a resolution authority as taught by

Moreh.   One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the

teachings of Moreh to permit users and service provides the flexibility of choosing

where to authenticate.   (see Moreh col. 2, lines 44-46)

Timson-Moreh does not specifically disclose an indication of a citizenship status of

the access candidate, an indication of a current location of the access candidate,

and an indication of an existence of a data access agreement with the access

candidate.

However, Orsini discloses the following:

b) at least a citizenship requirement and a location requirement for access to data

associated with the data class; (see Orsini paragraph [0013], lines 1-3;

paragraph [0060], lines 4-13: management of secure data, parameters (i.e.

attributes) agreement, location information)

c) an indication of a citizenship status of the access candidate, an indication of a

current location of the access candidate, and an indication of an existence of a

data access agreement with the access candidate; (see Orsini paragraph [0013],

lines 1-3; paragraph [0060], lines 4-13: management of secure data, parameters

(i.e. attributes) agreement, location information, citizenship information)

e) an indication of a citizenship status of the access candidate and an indication of a

current location of the access candidate; (see Orsini paragraph [0013], lines 1-3;

paragraph [0060], lines 4-13: management of secure data, parameters (i.e.

attributes) agreement, location information)

f) citizenship status and the current location of the access candidate with the

respective citizenship requirement and location requirement; (see Orsini

paragraph [0013], lines 1-3; paragraph [0060], lines 4-13: management of secure

data, parameters (i.e. attributes) agreement, location information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson-

Moreh for the request including an indication of a citizenship status of the access

candidate, an indication of a current location of the access candidate, and an

indication of an existence of a data access agreement with the access candidate as

taught by Orsini. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to

employ the teachings of Orsini for a relatively fast, secure, and efficient

authentication of data streams. (see Orsini paragraph [0012], lines 1-3; paragraph

[0013], lines 1-3)

Timson-Moreh-Orsini does not specifically disclose modifying access requirements.

However, Bacha discloses configured to modify access requirements associated

with the at least one data class. (see Bacha col. 10, lines 48-60: another authorized

user such as a resolution authority with ability to update access control information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson-

Moreh-Orsini for modifying access requirements as taught by Bacha. One of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Bacha

to improve system efficiency by centralization of user access information and to use

richer search parameters. (see Bacha col. 3, lines 18-24)

Regarding Claim 20, Timson discloses the system as in Claim 16, wherein one or

more access requirements associated with the one or more resources related. (see

Timson col. 3, lines 34-40; col. 3, lines 57-64: request processing; col. 2, lines 56-59;

col. 17, lines 4-11: country information, attributes)

Timson does not specifically disclose at least one of: a valid data access agreement

with a potential access candidate; a current location of the potential access candidate;

and a citizenship status of the potential access candidate.

However, Orsini discloses wherein at least one of: a valid data access agreement with a potential access candidate; a current location of the potential access candidate; and a citizenship status of the potential access candidate. (see Orsini paragraph [0013], lines 1-3; paragraph [0060], lines 4-13: management of secure data, parameters (i.e. attributes) agreement, location information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson for at least one of: a valid data access agreement with a potential access candidate; a current location of the potential access candidate; and a citizenship status of the potential access candidate as taught by Orsini. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Orsini for a relatively fast, secure, and efficient authentication of data streams.   (see Orsini paragraph [0012], lines 1-3; paragraph [0013], lines 1-3)

Regarding Claims 21, 34, 35, Timson discloses the system as in Claims 20, 30, 34, wherein one or more access candidate attributes. (see Timson col. 2, lines 50-56: attributes; col. 2, lines 56-59; col. 17, lines 4-11: country attribute, resource access) Timson does not specifically disclose at least one of: an indication of an existence of a data access agreement with the access candidate; a current location of the access candidate; and a citizenship status of the access candidate.

However, Orsini discloses wherein at least one of: an indication an existence of a data access agreement with the access candidate; a current location of the access

candidate; or a citizenship status of the access candidate. (see Orsini paragraph

[0013], lines 1-3; paragraph [0060], lines 4-13: management of secure data, parameters

(i.e. attributes) agreement, location information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson for at

least one of: an indication an existence of a data access agreement with the access

candidate; a current location of the access candidate; and a citizenship status of the

access candidate as taught by Orsini. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to employ the teachings of Orsini for a relatively fast, secure, and efficient

authentication of data streams. (see Orsini paragraph [0012], lines 1-3; paragraph

[0013], lines 1-3)

Regarding Claim 23, Timson discloses a system for providing an access candidate

access to secured electronic data, the electronic data being associated with one or

more data classes, each data class identifying at least a citizenship requirement and a

location requirement for access to data associated with the data class, the system

comprising:

  a) storage configured to receive and store the electronic data; (see Timson col. 18,

     lines 9-12; col. 18, lines 18-21: storage capability, data, information)

  Furthermore, Timson disclose the following:

  b) one or more resources configured to process and manipulate the electronic data;

     (see Timson col. 2, lines 31-34; col. 2, lines 40-41: interrogatable and enabling

     modules, resources to process and manipulate data)

e) adapted to authorize access to one or more portions of the electronic data in response to a comparison performed by a corresponding data access controller indicates access is prohibited; (see Timson col. 2, lines 31-34; col. 2, lines 40-41: interrogatable and enabling modules, resources (i.e. resolution authorities) to control access and manipulate data; col. 3, lines 34-40: authorization required to access data; col. 4, lines 7-11: access determination (comparison, match) required for access (i.e. prohibited without authorization)) and

f) a data access module configured to: evaluate a request for access to one or more portions of the electronic data by the one or more resources to identify one or more data access controllers corresponding to the one or more portions of the electronic data; (see Timson col. 3, lines 34-40; col. 3, lines 57-64: request processing; col. 2, lines 31-34; col. 2, lines 40-41: interrogatable and enabling modules, resources (i.e. controllers) to enable (i.e. grant) access to data)) and

g) forward the request for access to the one or more identified data access controllers for evaluation as to whether to grant the access candidate access to the corresponding one or more portions of the electronic data. (see Timson col. 3, lines 34-40; col. 3, lines 57-64: request processing (i.e. submit, forward request for processing); col. 2, lines 31-34; col. 2, lines 40-41: interrogatable and enabling modules, resources to enable (i.e. grant) control access to data))

Furthermore, Timson discloses wherein one or more data access controllers configured to grant access to a corresponding portion of the electronic data based at least in part on a comparison, and associated with one or more resources or data

classes of the corresponding portion of the electronic data. (see Timson col. 2, lines 31-34; col. 2, lines 40-41: interrogatable and enabling modules, resources to access and manipulate data; col. 4, lines 7-11: access enabled (i.e. granted))

Furthermore, Timson discloses access determination using additional authorization modules. (see Timson col 4, line 60 - col. 5, line 4: additional authorization modules)

Timson does not specifically disclose a resolution authority or a 3rd party providing authentication services.

However, Moreh discloses a resolution authority. (see Moreh col. 2, lines 48-62; col. 5, line 56 - col. 6, line 19: authentication services between client and server using intermediate entity (protocol proxy))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson to use authentication services such as a resolution authority as taught by Moreh. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Moreh to permit users and service provides the flexibility of choosing where to authenticate. (see Moreh col. 2, lines 44-46)

Timson-Moreh does not specifically disclose a citizenship status, a current location of the access candidate and an existence of a data access agreement with a citizenship requirement, location requirement and data access agreement requirement.

However, Orsini discloses the following:

c) a citizenship status and a current location of the access candidate and an

existence of a data access agreement with a citizenship requirement, wherein

the location requirement and the data access agreement requirement; (see

Orsini paragraph [0013], lines 1-3; paragraph [0060], lines 4-13: management of

secure data, parameters (i.e. attributes) agreement, location information)

d) the citizenship status and the current location of the access candidate with a

citizenship requirement and a location requirement;   (see Orsini paragraph

[0013], lines 1-3; paragraph [0060], lines 4-13: management of secure data,

parameters (i.e. attributes) agreement, location information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson-

Moreh for at least one of: an indication an existence of a data access agreement

with the access candidate; a current location of the access candidate; and a

citizenship status of the access candidate as taught by Orsini. One of ordinary skill

in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Orsini for a

relatively fast, secure, and efficient authentication of data streams.   (see Orsini

paragraph [0012], lines 1-3; paragraph [0013], lines 1-3)

Timson-Moreh-Orsini does not specifically disclose modifying access requirements.

However, Bacha discloses configured to modify the one or more access

requirements. (see Bacha col. 10, lines 48-60: another authorized user such as a

resolution authority with ability to update access control information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson-

Moreh-Orsini for modifying access requirements as taught by Bacha.   One of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Bacha

to improve system efficiency by centralization of user access information and to use

richer search parameters. (see Bacha col. 3, lines 18-24)

Regarding Claim 41, Timson discloses the method of claim 1. (see Timson col. 2, lines

31-34; col. 2, lines 40-41: interrogatable and enabling modules to control access and

manipulate data; col. 3, lines 34-40; col. 4, lines 7-11: authorization required to access

data)

Timson does not specifically disclose for supplemental evidence to verify the attributes.

However, Orsini discloses receiving supplemental evidence verifying the attributes of

the access candidate. (see Orsini paragraph [0013], lines 1-3; paragraph [0060], lines 4-

13: management of secure data, parameters (i.e. attributes) agreement, location

information)

      It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson-

Moreh for supplemental evidence such as current location to verify the attributes as

taught by Orsini. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ

the teachings of Orsini for a relatively fast, secure, and efficient authentication of data

streams.   (see Orsini paragraph [0012], lines 1-3; paragraph [0013], lines 1-3)

Regarding Claim 42, Timson discloses the system of claim 15, wherein the data

subsets are separated into the at least one data class based on a data provider of the

data (see Timson col. 2, lines 31-34; col. 2, lines 40-41: interrogatable and enabling

modules to control access and manipulate data; col. 3, lines 34-40; col. 4, lines 7-11:

authorization required to access data; col. 2, lines 50-59: one data class or attributes of

a class; financial and banking information (data provider))

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Carlton V. Johnson whose telephone number is 571-

270-1032. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday , 8:00 -

5:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Eleni A Shiferaw/   Carlton V. Johnson
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2436   Examiner
                                                        Art Unit 2436

CVJ
December 22, 2009